



IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE  
PATENT EXAMINING OPERATION

RECEIVED  
JUL 20 2005  
TECH CENTER 1600/2900

In re Application of:	§	Atty. Docket No.:	INGA,004/CIP
Charles A. Conrad	§		
	§		
Serial No.: 09/397,782	§	Examiner:	Martinell
	§		
Filed: September 16, 1999	§		
	§		
For: <b>IN VIVO PRODUCTION</b>	§	Group Art Unit:	1633
<b>OF ssDNA USING REVERSE</b>	§		
<b>TRANSCRIPTASE WITH</b>	§		
<b>PREDEFINED REACTION</b>	§		
<b>TERMINATION VIA</b>	§		
<b>STEM-LOOP FORMATION</b>	§		

COPY

COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS  
AND TRADEMARKS  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20231

**CERTIFICATE OF MAILING (37 CFR 1.8a)**

I hereby certify that this paper (along with any paper referred to as being attached or enclosed) is being deposited with the United States Postal Service on the date indicated below with sufficient postage as first class mail in an envelope addressed to the Commissioner of Patent and Trademarks, Washington, D.C. 20231.

*[Signature]*  
Mark R. Wisner, Registration No. 30,603

August 22, 2002  
Date

**RESPONSE TO OFFICIAL ACTION OF APRIL 22, 2002**

Dear Sir:

Applicant responds to the Official Action mailed in the captioned application on April 22, 2002 as follows. Also enclosed is a request for a one-month extension of the time to respond, and the Commissioner is authorized to charge the fee for a one-month extension to the Deposit Account listed thereon. In the event any enclosed check in the amount of any necessary fees was not properly executed, was not included with this Response and/or was insufficient in amount, or for any other reason this Response is not considered timely filed, request is hereby made for an extension of the time for the period necessary to ensure consideration of this Response and the Commissioner is authorized to charge Deposit Account No. 50-0965 (INGA,004/CIP) in the amount of any necessary fee.

**REMARKS**

In the Official Action of April 22, 2002, the Abstract was objected to as not being set out on a separate sheet and the disclosure was objected to because the sequence ID numbers were not set out in Table 1. In addition, claims 1-7 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102 as being anticipated by the Mirochnitchenko, *et al.*, Miyata, *et al.*, or Inouye, *et al.* references. For the following reasons, these objections/rejections are respectfully traversed.